

**FIERY ADMIRAL RICKOVER—FIREBALL IN RETIREMENT—CONTROVERSIAL FATHER OF NUCLEAR FLEET CONTINUES WORK ON REACTORS WITH AEC**

WASHINGTON.—Hyman G. Rickover, Saturday, stopped being the most controversial vice admiral on active duty in the Navy. He became the most controversial retired vice admiral in the Navy.

But his change in status will not diminish his influence in the Navy's drive for a nuclear-powered surface fleet.

The doughty, sharp-tongued father of the atomic submarines, a 120-pound dynamo of energy, will continue to be assistant chief for nuclear reactors for the Atomic Energy Commission.

He has to add the word "retired" after the words "vice admiral" in his official title, even though he is on active duty. According to law, precedent, and regulations he is not in line for further promotion.

**CREATED PRECEDENT**

Even the absence of promotion possibilities may be considered doubtful, since Rickover has created precedent frequently in the past and a special dispensation from Congress or the White House might elevate him further.

Rickover, who grew up in Chicago and was graduated from Annapolis Naval Academy in 1922, was forced to go on the retired list because he reached the age of 64 Monday. He already had been extended two years beyond the usual retirement age and the law contained no other loopholes of that kind.

Navy Secretary Paul H. Nitze instead took advantage of a provision that retired officers can always be summoned to active duty. He called Rickover back to his post effective instantaneously upon his retirement.

"Admiral Rickover is unquestionably the world's foremost authority on nuclear propulsion," Nitze said. "His contributions to the Navy and the Nation will be needed for so long as he is willing and able to serve his country."

**GATHERS ENEMIES**

The Secretary's high praise did nothing to remove general belief in the Defense Department that Rickover has accumulated more enemies than any other officer of his time.

This is scarcely surprising since he has repeatedly assailed the military service for incompetence, suggesting among other things a reduction of 20,000 in the number of Navy officers and the overhaul or closing of the service academies.

He also has lambasted sections of industry for poor workmanship and profiteering and has made a second profession of raking the American educational system over the coals.

But Rickover also has friends, and many of them are Members of Congress. Without help from these friends he would probably never have risen above the rank of captain, despite his achievements.

**GETS RESULTS**

The Congressmen like him for two main reasons:

He gets results, politically valuable in their districts. The United States fell behind in space and didn't do too well in some other fields but has always been pre-eminent in A-sub.

He gives them blunt talk instead of Government gobbledegook. It is widely suspected in Congress that much of the gobbledegook is ingeniously devised to say almost nothing, to gloss over unpleasant facts and to hide incompetence.

Rickover's part in building the atomic submarines beginning with the *Nautilus* is so well known that it sometimes comes as a surprise that he was awarded one of the Nation's highest decorations before he became interested in nuclear energy.

In 1946, after World War II service in the Bureau of Ships, he received the Legion of Merit for "overcoming tremendous procurement difficulties created by shortages in materials, manpower, and manufacturing facilities at a time when an unprecedented increase in production of electrical equipment was required."

He had some postwar duty with the Manhattan Project at Oak Ridge, Tenn., for which he received a commendation citing "outstanding service in connection with the development of the atomic bomb." But his work in nuclear propulsion did not begin until late 1947.

By mid-1952 he was receiving a gold star in lieu of a second Legion of Merit along with a citation generally regarded as an under statement.

"Captain Rickover, more than any other individual, is responsible for the rapid development of the nuclear ship program," the citation said. "He has held tenaciously to a single important goal through discouraging frustration and opposition."

Rickover's next big battle is expected to be for nuclear power in all or almost all of the Navy's surface combat ships. He has been forced to watch some backsliding after construction of the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, but the issue is still wide open.

**ADVANTAGES SEEN**

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's recent decision to build another conventionally powered carrier was carefully isolated as a special case to avoid further delay on that ship and without prejudice to the larger issue of future construction.

The setbacks may have had some advantage. In the meanwhile U.S. nuclear experts have learned how to build atomic propulsion systems in smaller sizes, more cheaply and with more durability in a single fuel loading.

This means that Rickover can present a better argument. Assured as he is of the ear of Congress, he can be expected to underscore in fiery and picturesque terms and on every suitable occasion his contention that there is no sense in building combat ships that are obsolete before they get to sea.

**Commodity Credit Corporation Wheat Sales Price**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. ALBERT H. QUIE**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 5, I received the following telegram from Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in Minneapolis, Minn. This is the text of Mr. Thatcher's telegram:

Cooperative grain farmers in States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Montana, have a vital interest in raising the Commodity Credit Corporation wheat sales price from 105 to 115 percent of the support price. This will make possible not only full support benefits to the producer, but also maximum use of regular private market channels including their own cooperatives. It would prevent the Department of Agriculture from depressing wheat prices by dumping CCC stocks. I hope you will support the amendment to be offered for this purpose when the full Agriculture Committee considers the Purcell wheat bill. Thank you for your consideration of a policy

crucial for normal marketing and efficient cooperation.

It is gratifying to receive this assurance of Mr. Thatcher's views concerning the CCC wheat sales price. I have advocated raising the price from 105 to 115 percent for a long time and such a provision is included in the voluntary wheat plan I introduced last May 23, as H.R. 6546. Most farm organizations now support the concept of raising the CCC price from 105 to 115 percent. They realize the disastrous effects on a farmer's income when the Department of Agriculture hands down the level of market prices. We must take action to prevent the Department of Agriculture from taking over the grain markets.

**A Regrettable Incident**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, today in the great debate over civil rights and civil liberties, we find men of judgment and purpose hard at work in an effort to seek the truth and further the great constitutional concept that Americans are a people governed by laws and not men. But occasionally during this struggle for truth and equality, there are those who would deviate from high purpose, would encourage the forces of revolution, and would incite emotional reaction. Such an event has just occurred in my district. Mr. Milford M. Foxwell has expressed, in his letter of February 5, 1964, to me, an American's reaction to this regrettable incident:

DEAR Mr. MORTON: Before I get into my reasons for writing to you, there are one or two points I would like to make clear. First of all, I am not a racist, segregationist, or integrationist in any way, shape or form, but I am a lifetime resident of Dorchester County and cannot help but to become concerned with a situation that could easily destroy a system of government which has been proven to be the best on earth, and the part of that government to which I refer is our system of lawmaking and law enforcement. This phase I should think is among the most important in respect to our way of life. Certainly many of our dollars are spent in this direction, to say nothing of the countless number of people who dedicate their entire lives in this field.

My decision to write this letter came after reading an article which appeared in our local newspaper, the Daily Banner, under this date, a clipping of which I am enclosing. The Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Representative of the State of New York, addressed a meeting of the Cambridge Non-Violent Action Committee on Tuesday February 4, 1964, and the contents of his address, which are outlined in the enclosed clipping, are certainly out of order with respect to the position he holds as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

I fully realize that freedom of speech is a prime principle on which this country was founded and I pray that this never changes, but it appears to me that we are headed for disaster if any man is allowed to address any group, white or colored, by telling them, and I quote "It is divinely right for the people of

February 7

Cambridge, Md., to break the law until they have had a share in making the law." Without arguing whether or not these people have a share in making the laws (which they do or else Mr. POWELL would not be a Congressman) Mr. POWELL should not be allowed to make such a statement, which could possibly incite a riot and in turn injure or even kill someone. I think Mr. POWELL or anyone else, white or colored, should be called on the carpet for such statements to any gathering of people regardless of their intent.

I am 32 years old, have a wife and two sons and my wife and I are both law-abiding people and we are trying desperately to raise our children as such. However, I found it extremely difficult to answer my 11-year-old son when he asked me "who is that man in that picture" (Mr. POWELL) because I do not believe that Mr. POWELL's remarks are suitable for those of a Congressman nor do I want my children to believe that such remarks are typical of the members of your fraternity.

I have been educated to believe that my share in making our laws is the right to vote, but according to Mr. POWELL this is wrong, and violence in lieu of reasoning is right where some people disagree with various aspects of our Government. This is certainly not the rule, but rather the exception or else we wouldn't be able to walk our streets in safety.

Should the type of encouragement Mr. POWELL gave his audience lead to violence, destruction of property and even personal injury, in my opinion he could be held responsible and should be held accountable for his actions. If the office you and Mr. POWELL hold does not maintain a higher standard of ethics than what he has shown to both the colored and white people of Cambridge, then I am wondering how all of us are supposed to live by laws that you help to make.

I want to stress again the fact that this in no way represents my views on civil rights, segregation, or integration. I merely feel that the laws of our Nation should be enforced regardless of who breaks them or for whatever reasons they may be broken, and that Mr. POWELL did this community, State and Nation a terrible injustice by the remarks he made.

Respectfully yours,  
MILFORD M. FOXWELL.

*Cuba*  
**Firmness Requested in Our Dealings  
With Cuba and Panama**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. ED FOREMAN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, our soft, vacillating foreign policy continues to embarrass our allies and degrade our image and prestige around the world when we let two-bit, leftist, Communist sympathizers like Castro shove the United States around and intentionally violate treaties and international agreements such as the water supply agreement to Guantanamo Naval Base and permit violations of such as our Panama Canal Zone Treaty.

If we expect to remain a world opinion leader and maintain the respect of our allies, we must put some firmness and backbone in our dealings and reactions over such incidents. We will not gain respect by continuing to give in, back

down, writing letters of protest as we did over the U.S. fliers who were shot down in Germany last week, or by selling wheat to the Communists and guaranteeing their credit.

Specifically, if Castro persists in refusing to supply the Guantanamo Base water in disaccord with our long-standing agreement, then we should move immediately to restore the water supply by taking over control of the supply facilities. Second, Castro hostilities continuing, we should establish a sea blockade around Cuba to prohibit the shipment of all goods to that island except medicines and necessary foodstuffs. Further, we should initiate immediate hard-hitting negotiations with our allies to stop their aid and trade to Cuba. Admittedly, the latter would be more difficult, now that this administration has agreed to aid Communist Russia with the shipment of U.S. subsidized wheat and other goods.

### H.R. 9744, Explanation and Analysis

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK J. HORTON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week on January 28, I introduced H.R. 9744, a bill to terminate the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project area and plan to restore certain property in the District of Columbia to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes. Subsequently, my bill was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Since the introduction of this measure, there has developed considerable interest in how the bill, if enacted, would be implemented. Other pertinent questions also have been raised.

In an attempt to explain the intent of my legislative proposal, acknowledge the interest being evidenced toward it, and answer the questions I have heard, I am offering these remarks. At their conclusion, I am submitting a sectional analysis of the bill.

I think it is important at the outset to establish that the general concept of urban renewal is deserving of enthusiastic endorsement. Community improvement through the elimination of slums and blight and the removal of their causes is essential to the public welfare.

Poor housing, traffic congestion, inadequate sites for commercial and industrial growth, downtown decay, and neighborhood deterioration are proper targets for improvement programs, using public and private resources. Failure to plan and execute such programs carries a high cost, measured both in human and in economic values.

The incidence of disease, crime, and juvenile delinquency is more frequent in rundown areas than elsewhere. Blight creates greater needs for municipal services, while slum areas return less tax revenue to the municipality. The suffering brought from slum and

blighting conditions is widespread and needs attention at all governmental levels.

There is, in my belief, a legitimate role for the Federal Government in urban renewal. It is to make available Federal assistance, in the form of grants and/or loans, to finance surveys and plans; to acquire, clear, and prepare land for redevelopment; and to relocate site residents. Congress repeatedly has recognized its constitutional obligation to remove a burden on the public welfare and, to that end, has enacted appropriate legislation.

Urban renewal is not without its faults, however. In fact, its administration has been far from faultless. The concept has been crippled by bureaucratic bungling, inertia, and inexperience, and relocation resistance.

By startling coincidence, Mr. Speaker, on the very day that I introduced H.R. 9744 in the interests of remedying the unfortunate utilization of urban renewal in Washington's Columbia Plaza project, there appeared in the Wall Street Journal a front-page story by Reporter Stanley Penn detailing the ills of urban renewal. It is pertinent, I believe, for me to share with my colleagues in the House, the following excerpt from Mr. Penn's article:

In some cities, projects are going ahead on schedule and making dramatic changes in slum areas. But despite a measure of progress, most of the property cities have acquired for urban renewal purposes hasn't yet been developed.

Of the 22,000 acres purchased by cities since the program began in 1949, only 6,800 have been resold to redevelopers. Among the remainder, 6,000 acres haven't been cleared yet of old buildings; another 3,300 have been cleared but no redevelopers have been found; and 5,900 acres are cleared and appear close to being sold to redevelopers.

With this overview in mind, and before presenting the section-by-section analysis of H.R. 9744, I want to address my remarks specifically to the reasons which prompted—if not, provoked—my introduction of this bill.

I serve on Subcommittee No. 4 of the District of Columbia Committee. During 1963, this subcommittee spent a great deal of time conducting hearings and studying the matter of urban renewal in the District of Columbia. Within the scope of this examination came Columbia Plaza.

From the information produced, I concluded that the approval by the District Commissioners of Columbia Plaza as an urban renewal project entitled to financial assistance under the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, was improper. This resulted from the presentation to the Commissioners of documentation that was not entirely representative of fact.

Urban renewal funds under the act cited above can be made available only where evidence of slum and deteriorated conditions meet certain specific criteria, including building and environmental deficiencies. Very definite standards must be met. Further, the District of Columbia, under the Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, prescribes statutory provisions for such standards: